DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 614 EA 032 485

AUTHOR	Laurence, Wendy; Hass, Bob; Burr, Elizabeth; Fuller, Bruce; Gardner, Mary; Hayward, Gerald; Kuboyama, Emlei
TITLE	Incentives for Attracting and Retaining K-12 Teachers: Lessons for Early Education. Policy Brief.
INSTITUTION	Policy Analysis for California Education, Berkeley, CA.
REPORT NO	PACE-02-3
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), University of California, Berkeley School of Education, 3653 Tolman Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-1670. Tel: 510-642-7223; Fax: 510-642-9148; e-mail: PACE123@socrates.berkeley.edu; Web site: http://pace.berkeley.edu/pace_about.html. For full text: http://pace.berkeley.edu/ Policy_Brief_02-3_Teach.Inc.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Beginning Teachers; Contract Salaries; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Labor Market; Labor Turnover; Nursery Schools; Preschool Education; *Preschool Teachers; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Salaries; Teacher Shortage; Teacher Supply and Demand
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This policy brief examines programs from California and elsewhere in the United States for attracting and retaining quality preschool and child-care staff and places these programs within the broader context of K-12 reforms. While this brief is specifically aimed at early-childhood-education planners and policymakers, it contains information for educators at all levels about experimental efforts and lessons on systemwide reform. The brief reviews the evidence on the scope and effectiveness of existing K-12 recruitment and retention policy strategies in the United States to determine those that may be transferable to early education. It begins with a broad review of what is known about these state initiatives. It then provides detailed examples and analyses for each program area from education nonprofit and research centers. It then reviews the evidence to determine the variety and effectiveness of existing programs. Few of the programs highlighted have been formally evaluated, and fewer still have collected data on cost-effectiveness. Finally, the brief returns to the question of how these program models may or may not fit the problem of teacher and staff turnover in the early-care and education arenas. (Contains 7 endnotes, 7 tables, and 62 references.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 614

Incentives for Attracting and Retaining K-12 Teachers: Lessons for Early Education. Policy Brief.

Wendy Laurence
Bob Hass
Elizabeth Burr
Bruce Fuller
Mary Gardner
Gerald Hayward
Emlei Kuboyama

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

EA 032 485

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PACE

POLICY BRIEF NOVEMBER 2002

Incentives for Attracting and Retaining K–12 Teachers: Lessons for Early Education

By Wendy Laurence, Bob Hass, Elizabeth Burr, Bruce Fuller, Mary Gardner, Gerald Hayward, Emlei Kuboyama

EA032 485

Policy Brief 02-3

California recently embarked on a sizable experiment aimed at reducing the steady turnover of preschool teachers and allied child-care staff. The state's taxpayers are now investing over $21 million annually in these county-run programs, offering salary supplements and incentives for professional development. These local experiments are blossoming largely in isolation from larger efforts in the public schools that also attempt to attract and retain a quality workforce.

In just the past decade, nearly half of all states in the U.S. have mounted efforts to retain and boost the quality of preschool and child-care staff. These initiatives are detailed in recent reports and informative websites. (See the Center for the Child Care Workforce website: www.ccw.org/initiatives/stateinit.html.) This policy brief places these programs in the broader context of K–12 reforms, and examines programs both in California and elsewhere in the U.S.

While the brief is specifically aimed at early childhood education planners and policymakers, educators at all levels will find new information about experimental efforts and lessons on systemwide reform. What most distinguishes K–12 reforms from those in early education is their scale and scope. K–12 reforms have been underway for a longer period of time, are more numerous and diverse, and usually better-funded.

Similar Teacher Shortages and Turnover

Like many states, California faces a shortage of qualified teachers. Every year, many school districts scramble to fill their teaching positions. The shortage is most severe in urban and rural districts, and especially in areas with a large percentage of low-performing students. Teachers credentialed to teach science, mathematics, special education, and bilingual teachers are in greatest demand. Policymakers and administrators have adopted a variety of strategies to attract a large number of qualified teachers and to retain them. This has resulted in a wide range of K–12 programs at the state, district, and individual school level.

In this policy brief, we review the evidence on the scope and effectiveness of existing K–12 recruitment and retention policy strategies in the U.S. to determine those that may be transferable to early education. We begin with a broad review of what's known about these state initiatives. Later we provide detailed examples and analyses for each program area from education nonprofit and research

centers. We then review the evidence to determine the variety and effectiveness of existing programs. The variety of program models in the public school area is in distinct contrast to the conceptually simpler models devised in the early education field to date.

All the program models featured here have the same aim: to increase the number of K–12 professionals while maintaining quality. These practices provide fresh insights for early education policymakers concerned about ways of attracting and retaining child-care professionals. However, few of the programs highlighted in this report have been formally evaluated and fewer still have collected data on cost effectiveness. Despite the large sums of public funds devoted to these programs, little information exists on which strategies have proven effective and why.

Each program described in this report generally represents one recruitment and retention policy strategy. It is unlikely, however, that a single strategy will produce the results that policymakers and educators want. A multifaceted approach may be more successful given variable local conditions. We will return to the question of how these program models may, or may not, fit the problem of teacher and staff turnover in the early care and education arenas.

TABLE 1. Strategy Categories and Policy Options

#1: Reduce barriers to entering the profession.

- Attract students to a career in teaching during high school and college.
- Strengthen multiple pathways into teaching and school leadership.
- Offer incentives to attract more teachers of color into the profession.
- Offer incentives to teach at schools with large percentages of high-need students.

#2: Provide more financial supports for teachers.

- Increase salaries and offer bonuses.
- Make available loans and loan forgiveness programs.
- Offer benefit programs such as medical insurance and child care.
- Create a local housing assistance program, and help teachers utilize federal and state programs.

#3: Increase teaching expertise through expanded professional support for new and experienced teachers.

- Improve teacher induction for beginning teachers.
- Support the development of teacher leaders who can coach and mentor others.
- Ensure that high-quality professional development reaches teachers and administrators in high-need communities.
- Provide ongoing opportunities for professional growth that reduce isolation and burnout, improve classroom practices, and support teacher leadership.

Overview of Policy Options

Policymakers will want to keep in mind a number of overarching concerns in formulating their recruitment and retention strategy, especially as early education activists take note of K–12 policy strategies. Have adequate funds been allocated to implement the plan? Does it take a multifaceted approach, for example, blending wage and economic incentives with efforts to advance professional commitment to the field? Does it contain an evaluation component that measures cost effectiveness, retention figures for effective educators, and impacts on student achievement? How will teachers be informed of policy strategies and provided opportunities to make use of them? And finally, does the program encourage teachers to enter high-need credential or geographic areas?

A useful way to view recruitment and retention programs is by strategy

TABLE 2. Funding for Recruitment and Retention of California K–12 Teachers, 2002

Program	Amount	Highlights
Professional Development Days	$224 million	Districts determine inservice training strategies.
Peer Assistance and Review	$134 million	Support for mentoring and coaching of teachers.
District Incentives for Equity	$118 million	Funding for districts to develop incentives to attract new teachers into low-performing schools.
Professional Development Institutes	$54 million	Stipends of up to $1000 to $2500 for attendance and completion of professional institutes for teachers and administrators.
Support for Beginning Teachers	$104 million	Districts may use funds to sponsor a state-approved beginning teachers induction program, or create their own, to meet new state guidelines requiring all new teachers to participate in a state-approved induction program.
National Board Certification	$15 million	Incentives from $10,000 for attaining National Board Certification, to $20,000 for attaining National Board Certification and agreeing to teach 4 years in an under-achieving school.
Loan Assumptions	$5 million	Assumption of loans up to $11,000 for teachers completing program and who agree to teach 4 years in a low-performing school.
Other Programs	$6 million	Includes tax credits, home loan assistance, bonuses to teachers in schools that meet their Academic Performance Index (API) growth targets; and Governor's Fellowships, which pay $20,000 to teachers who agree to teach four years at low-performing schools.

categories. We identified three categories that cover most policy options represented by the programs surveyed (Table 1). The first, *reducing barriers to entering the profession,* refers to policy options such as precollegiate career exploration, alternative pathways to licensure, and incentive programs. The second, *providing financial supports,* encompasses approaches that increase the ability of teachers to support themselves and their families, such as higher salaries, bonuses, and other financial incentives, including loans and housing assistance. The third, *increasing professional supports,* provides teachers with tools to increase student achievement, including induction, mentoring, teacher assessment, and staff development.

California's Sizeable Investment

The need for fully credentialed teachers is expected to multiply over the next decade, presenting a challenge for states to recruit and retain a qualified corps of teaching professionals. According to 1997 data from the National Center for Education Statistics, 20% of teachers abandon the profession within the first three years, while 9% leave within their first year of teaching. Analysts in California express concern that to meet this need, the placement of under-qualified teachers—those holding emergency permits or interns—will increase. Hardest hit by this trend are California's lowest performing schools, which already contain a disproportionate number of teachers with emergency permits. According to one study, urban school districts experience the greatest teacher attrition, with close to 50% of new teachers leaving the profession during their first five years (Darling-Hammond & Schlan, 1996). At the same time, the number of interns in low-performing schools is almost six times greater than in the highest-performing schools (CFTL, 2001).

Although the statistics sound grim, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) reports that improvements are being made in recruiting and retaining qualified teachers. In their recent report on Emergency Permits and Credential Waivers (CTC, 1999–2000), CTC indicates that the number of certificated staff has increased by 4.1% over the previous year and "emergency permits increased only 1.3%, an indication that California is beginning to meet the demand for non-emergency teachers."

This year, California will spend almost $660 million on programs encouraging qualified candidates to complete teacher preparation programs, teach in low-performing schools, and stem the tide of attrition. Programs receiving substantial state funding are highlighted in Table 2. The state's effort to retain preschool and center teachers pales in comparison to these more ambitious efforts in the K–12 arena. Currently California is spending about $21 million annually on efforts to reduce staff turnover and advance training incentives among early education teachers.

Large Investments in Other States

The issue of funding recruitment and retention efforts has gained legislative attention in several states around the country. For example, Florida is spending approximately $205 million annually on programs such as scholarship and loan forgiveness, bonuses, and mentor-teacher programs. Conversely, Illinois is in the process of writing education reforms and is spending virtually no state money on recruitment and retention programs. The worry is that, without solid cost-effectiveness data, states will spend more and more to produce new teachers without stemming high exit rates from the field.

On the other hand, some state programs are facing cutbacks due to the current economic downturn. For example, the Washington legislature recently cut $40 million in funding for professional development programs. California, likewise, may soon see cuts in programs such as National Certification incentives, API rewards, and teacher training stipends. A comparison of funding levels in other states is presented in Table 3. The information was gathered primarily through phone interviews with staff, and from state education and teacher association web sites. In some cases, it may be incomplete.

Variation in Strategies Nationwide

Next we turn to the various policy strategies being used by recruitment and retention programs in the U.S. In some instances, we also detail specific programs that seem innovative or that have preliminary data available on their effectiveness.

■ Strategy Category #1: Reduce barriers to entering the profession

Develop Pipelines for Potential Teachers.

Some school districts have begun to develop their own pipeline of local candidates in order to meet demands for new teachers. Most programs that target middle and high school students offer them a glimpse into teaching through service learning, where students receive hands-on experience working with younger students and are exposed to masterful teachers. This can be an effective way to reach a significant number of students of

color. College-level pipeline programs offer support and guidance through service learning opportunities, career advice, or financial aid counseling. Many college programs do not require participants to teach while they are undergraduates, a practice that deserves to be evaluated carefully.

Teacher Cadets

South Carolina's Teacher Cadets is a pipeline program aimed at high school students throughout the state that is being emulated across the nation. The South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment (SCCTR) administers the program.

By exposing students to the world of teaching before college, it is hoped that many will later choose teaching as a career. The program reaches 2,500 high school students each year through classes taught by certified teachers trained by SCCTR. To participate, students must have a minimum grade point average of 3.0 and must take college preparatory classes. Participants earn social studies elective credit while gaining insight into the nature of teaching, the problems of schooling, and other critical issues in education.

Currently, 35% of participants have indicated a clear intention to teach, while 2,000 alumni currently teach in

TABLE 3. Funding for Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Other States, 2002

State	Estimated Amount	Programs Include
Florida	$205 million	Funding for Teacher Retention Bonuses ($850 per eligible teacher), teacher training programs, incentives for attaining National Board Certification, and planning grants for Mentor-Teacher programs.
New York	$130 million	Teachers for Tomorrow, New Teacher Induction Program, Math and Science Fellowships, Teacher Opportunity Corps, Targeted Instructional Grants, and Teacher Center Funds (professional development).
Missouri	$105 million	Career Ladder Retention Program, Regional Professional Development Centers, Select Teachers as Regional Resources and Teacher Training Initiative (both linked to Missouri Assessment Program). There are no existing loan assumption programs.
Washington	$100 million (biennium)	Teacher Induction Program ($1400 allocated to districts for each beginning teacher), the Staffing Enhancement component of the Better Schools Initiative, National Certification incentives, and the Teacher Assistance Program (mentoring program).
Nevada	$45 million	New teacher bonuses of $2000, 3% salary increase across the board, and National Certification incentives.
Texas	$18 million (biennium)	Teach for Texas Forgivable Loan Program, Texas Beginning Educators Support Program, Statewide Teacher Recruitment Campaign (in the planning stage so no money attached yet), Classroom Teacher Loan Repayment Program (recently passed by legislature, subject to availability of funds in budget).

the South Carolina public schools (SCCTR, 2001). The University of South Carolina is working with SCCTR to pilot an end-of-course assessment for the Teacher Cadet Program. SCCTR has also begun training school district staff in other states on how to set up similar programs.

Call Me Mister

A middle school through college-level pipeline program, Call Me Mister, is notable because it specifically targets African-American men to teach in elementary schools throughout South Carolina. This pilot program is in its second year of operation, and each year recruits about 20 men from each of three historically black colleges in the state—Benedict College, Claflin College, and Morris College. Students participate in 300 hours of service learning and form a supportive cohort group. Members are expected to complete their education degree in four years.

The program provides educational grants, financial aid counseling, and guidance regarding the college experience. Call Me Mister grants may include up to $5,000 for tuition, room and board, and $450 per semester for books. (Tuition, and room and board at Benedict College, the most expensive of the three colleges, is a little over $14,000 per year.) The first year of the program was financed by an award from the Sunshine Lady Foundation. The total cost of the program is expected to be $4.8 million over six years.

The program also runs a series of summer career camps for middle and high school students. The camps provide an opportunity to participate in a simulated college experience. Follow-up programs encourage families to support the idea of higher education for their children (Parks, 2000).

Clemson University is currently developing an evaluation of the program which will include consideration of the state's learning objectives and standardized testing. However, nationwide only 24% of pre-collegiate programs surveyed by Recruiting New Teachers (a nationwide organization) reported employing an external evaluation (RNT, 1996). These types of programs appear to promote high academic standards, encourage effective teaching techniques, and offer a means of recruiting students of color.

Offer New Teachers Incentives and Additional Support

A number of other programs now exist to recruit and retain teachers from groups underrepresented in the teaching profession, for hard-to-staff schools or areas, and in academic areas experiencing a teacher shortage. Many help prospective teachers apply to graduate school and provide support, sometimes including tuition, during their teacher education training. The weakness of such programs, according to a recent review by Planning and Evaluation Service (PES), is the "lack of evaluation data on the effectiveness of existing models of teacher recruitment" (Clewell, 2000).

Institute for Recruitment of Teachers

A unique program at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, aims to find outstanding college juniors, seniors, and graduates of color, and "talk with them about the value of teaching while preparing them for graduate school" (Reid, 2001). Prospective students participate in the program in one of two ways, either as an associate or as a summer intern.

Associates are coached through the graduate school application process, often by utilizing long-distance communication methods. All services are free and 39 participating universities waive application fees. Summer interns participate in a month-long summer program, where the institute counsels students in their choice of graduate schools and guides them through the application process. Students also participate in a program designed to help them succeed in their advanced studies.

To date, 574 students have completed the program. The institute "has helped 364 African-Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans complete master's and doctoral degrees in education. Of these students, almost one-third are working in elementary and secondary schools today, while 149 are working on their doctorate" (Reid, 2001). The program has a privately funded $525,000 budget for 118 participants per year. Recently a multi-year grant was received from the Mellon Foundation to offset its operational expenses (Reid, 2001).

Pathways to Teaching Careers
Established by the Dewitt Wallace-Readers Digest Fund, this model recruits teachers from diverse backgrounds—paraprofessionals, Peace Corps volunteers, substitutes, and emergency credentialed teachers—and then offers them a traditional pathway into teaching. Pathways programs are now located in 42 states nationwide. They offer academic and social support as well as tuition coverage while participants complete licensure programs. Additional stipends may cover the rest of the tuition fees and may offer monies to purchase books and other education supplies.

Initial evaluation results are promising. These new teachers are exceeding average expectations for performance once they are licensed (Clewell, 2000). "The program has met and exceeded its recruitment goals and is able to show a retention rate that is significantly higher than the national rate of retention in a teacher education program. Furthermore, the percentage of minority participants that Pathways has been able to recruit far exceeds the representation of minorities in the teaching force" (Clewell, 2000).

Alternative Pathways Into Teaching.

Many programs have been created to offer alternative means of entry into the teaching profession. Their goals and components vary greatly. To facilitate comparison, Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) compiled a sampling of programs (Table 4).

Both the incentive and alternative pathways programs do seem to increase the number of minority teachers entering the field and provide alternative methods of entry for those who have the educational background but are not certified. For all of the programs (except Recruiting New Teachers, which was not included in the study), Clewell (2000) found that the evaluations of these programs show they are meeting their recruitment goals. In most cases, they are also exceeding the national average for retention of their participants. Little is known, however, about the quality of teaching provided. Cost effectiveness data also remain unavailable.

Help Teachers Navigate the Credentialing and Application Process.

The process to become a credentialed teacher is a complex one that involves examinations, fingerprinting, transcript requirements, multiple forms, as well as numerous communications with school district staff and in-person visits to district offices. As an incentive to attract new teachers, many school districts, as well as some states, have begun doing more to help applicants negotiate the credentialing and application process.

Savvy and persistent teachers often find a position by circumventing the district application process and applying directly with schools or locating a position through their own networking efforts. Once hired, however, they still must follow up to make sure their paperwork is complete. Often this experience is enough to make some candidates think twice about entering the teaching profession.

The following programs represent the various approaches that states and individual districts are currently using to address this issue. While some statistical information, such as the number of website hits, was available on these programs, no more sophisticated data was found. Therefore, it is not yet possible to evaluate either program or cost effectiveness.

Teacher Recruitment Centers
Recognizing the difficulty prospective new hires face, New York City and the states of California and South Carolina have created teacher recruitment centers designed to guide prospective teachers through the application process. While the process often remains cumbersome and expensive, these centers assist candidates through the bureaucratic maze.

For instance, in the summer of 2001, New York's recruitment center emailed candidates with information guiding them through the credentialing process. The center also provided prospective teachers with directions to various job fairs (New York City Board of Education, 2001). In California, the state's CalTeach website offers recruitment information as well as access to information on statewide resources and available teacher incentives (California State University Chancellor's Office, 2001). The South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment (SCCTR) informs candidates about financial aid assistance opportunities,

recruitment across the state, continuing education classes, and assistance with National Board Certification (SCCTR, 2001).

Teacher Retention Units

In Chicago, the human resources department for the city's schools has formed a Teacher Retention Unit. Their responsibility is to educate administrators about retention strategies, research the issue of retention, and conduct exit interviews. They also provide "911 services," helping to relocate teachers within the

TABLE 4. A Comparison of Alternative Entry Programs, 2000

Program	Location	Program Goal	Program Components	Evaluation/Outcome
Teach for America	Nationwide	Recruit academically prepared, diverse corps to teach for 2 years in urban and rural schools	Summer training 2-year commitment	High percentage of minority participants Recruits academically capable participants 88–89% retention rates
Troops to Teachers	Nationwide	Recruit former armed services personnel into the education field	No academic training offered May enter as aide, teacher, or vocational teacher	Effective recruiting with 3,355 participants to date High percentage of male, math, and science teachers
LAUSD Intern Program	Los Angeles, CA	Recruit secondary English, math, and science teachers as well as elementary and bilingual teachers	Mentoring Continuous training for 2 years Pre-service training	Met goal of recruiting academically capable interns Higher than national average retention rates
Houston Independent School District Alternative Certification Program	Houston, TX	Fill critical shortage areas, including librarians Offer alternative certification route	1-year internship with summative evaluation Mentors Pre-service training University course work	Recruits large numbers of interns who fit their profiles Claim a 85% retention rate (but no time frame was given)

Data summarized from Clewell, 2000. Source: Planning and Evaluation Service.

system and helping them to locate necessary resources (Chicago Public Schools, 2001).

Creative Use of Technology

Some school districts are harnessing the power of technology to simplify the application process and increase the effectiveness of their recruitment programs. The New Haven Unified School District in California, which has a high percentage of students eligible for reduced-price lunch, is a case in point. Their website offers practical resources for prospective applicants. At the site, they can view current job listings, apply for a teaching position, and find out about alternate certification programs the district offers in conjunction with California State University, Hayward. Candidates may even be interviewed from across the United States through the use of teleconferencing technology. The 13,300-student school district also employs its own full-time credential specialist to assist new teachers with the credentialing process (Snyder, 1999).

Licensed But Not Teaching

In 1994 the United Kingdom created the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), charged with "raising standards by attracting able and committed people" into the teaching field (TTA, 2001). While many of their strategies are similar to the incentives and alternative credentialing offered in the United States, they have created an innovative set of programs that address the large numbers of teachers who are credentialed but not teaching. Incentives include signing bonuses, "returner courses" to bring candidates' skills back up to speed, child care, and a "Keeping in Touch" program that offers a newsletter and support for returning teachers.

Strategy Category #2: Provide more financial supports for teachers.

Financial incentive programs take many forms. There are salary increases and bonuses aimed at attracting new teachers and retaining experienced ones. There are also educational loans and loan forgiveness options that reduce the financial barriers of entry into the profession, or mitigate the "costs" (lost income) of remaining in teaching rather than entering a more lucrative profession. Other incentive programs address financial concerns of teachers such as housing, benefits, and retirement.

Such programs assist teachers in overcoming financial obstacles and may, at least in part, be viewed by teachers as compensation for the lower salaries they command in the workplace. Still, little data exists to show which types or combinations of economic incentives are most effective.

Base Salaries

Given the current teacher shortage nationwide, districts and states find themselves competing for teachers. In Washington state, for example, policymakers suspect that California's higher salaries are luring its teachers away (Washington Education Association, 2001). In the summer of 1999, Oklahoma estimated that 1,000 teachers left their state for higher-paying teaching positions in other states. In response, the state increased salaries by $3,000 (Blair, 2000). To stem the loss of teachers from Arkansas, in 2001, lawmakers also increased teacher salaries by $3,000 over a two-year period (Gehring, 2001).

Statistics suggest that teachers who are willing to relocate may be influenced by salaries. However, data is not available to determine how long these teachers remain in a new district or how much salaries need to be raised to influence a teacher's decision to enter, stay in, or leave the profession. In general, as teachers progress through their careers, the annual salary of those having earned a master's degree and who are in the 44–50 age bracket is almost $24,000 lower than their peers in other fields with a master's degree (Wilson, 2000). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2000, the mean hourly wage was $7.86 for a child-care worker, and $9.66 for a preschool teacher. This compares to $11.96 for a secretary, $13.10 for a bus driver, and $26.82 for a kindergarten teacher (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000).

In 1999–2000, the average K–12 salary for a first-year teacher in the U.S. was $27,989 (or $25,433 in California). During the same period, the average salary for a child-care worker in California was $17,420, and for a preschool teacher $21,130 .

Many educators and policymakers now agree that salaries should not be raised without maintaining quality

control. Stanford University's Linda Darling-Hammond points out that Connecticut recently increased teacher salaries and instituted higher standards for teachers (2000). Eric Hirsch of the State Higher Education Officers Association reports that North Carolina has done the same thing under the Excellent Schools Act of 1997 (2001). Similarly, California's New Haven district has also been able to attract top candidates with high salaries that are accompanied by high teaching standards (Snyder, 1999).

Bonuses

Bonus programs may provide teachers with the financial incentive to enter a district or return each year. There is a practical side to bonus programs. The money comes at a time when new teachers are struggling to make ends meet, since many new teachers begin teaching in August, but do not see a paycheck until the first of October. While bonuses may entice new teachers to a particular district, there is no evidence to suggest that bonuses encourage teachers to remain in a district over time.

TABLE 5. A Comparison of Teacher Bonus Programs in the U.S., 2000

Location	Type of Bonus	Amount	Who is eligible
Massachusetts	Signing	$20,000 $8,000 paid in year 1, $4,000 paid annually for the next 3 years.	Teachers accepted into state-run alternative credentialing/fellowship program. All fellows do not receive bonus.
New York	Signing	$2,000	Teachers accepted into state-run alternative credentialing/fellowship program.
Ft. Worth, TX	Signing	$2,000	New to district in areas of high need.
Des Moines, IA	Signing	$2,100 paid over three years.	New to district in areas of high need.
Philadelphia, PA	Hard-to-staff schools	$2,000 per year	Teachers at schools with recruitment problems. May be combined with high-need credentialing bonus.
Philadelphia, PA	High credentialing needs	$1,500 per year	Licensed teachers of math, Spanish, chemistry, physics, special education, and bilingual.
Palo Verde, CA	Moving	$500	New to district.
Eagle School District, CO	Return to work: paid each fall for returning teachers.	$1,000	All returning teachers.
Hartford, CT	Return to work: paid each fall for returning teachers.	$100 for each year of service	All returning teachers.

TABLE 6. Bonus Pay for Board-Certified Teachers, 2001

State	Skill-Based Pay Incentive	Number of National Board Certified Teachers*
Ohio	$2,500 per year for life of certificate	1,335
North Carolina	12% of base pay per year for life of certificate	3,660
California	$10,000 one-time payment	1,303

*Nationwide there are 16,037 National Board Certified Teachers. Information obtained from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2001. Available online at http://www.nbpts.org.

Teacher Bonus Program

Garnering much recent attention is Massachusetts' $1.7 million program aimed at attracting people to the teaching profession. Under the program, each new teacher receives a $20,000 bonus, paid in installments over three years, and must participate in a fellowship program for alternative credentialing. Following the program's initial year, the turnover rate has remained close to the national average (Archer, 2000).

A sampling of other bonus programs is presented in Table 5.

Additional Pay and Merit Bonuses

Salary supplements can take a variety of forms.[1] One form is associated with the merit pay model. Another form is what the University of Wisconsin's Allen Odden refers to as skill-based pay. Teachers are given the opportunity to receive pay in exchange for furthering their knowledge. For instance, an increasing number of states or districts now compensate teachers for achieving National Board Certification (Odden, 2000). (See Table 6.) When the number of teachers with national certification in each state is compared to the size of the pay incentive, it is interesting to note that states with incentive programs have higher numbers of National Board Certified teachers. This finding is, of course, very preliminary, since states that have recently instituted teacher pay incentive programs have not had sufficient time for teachers to have completed the rigorous National Board Certification program and passed the test. Tying salary increments to additional training is quite similar to the basic retention incentive model being advanced in the early education arena.

Districts sometimes offer several types of additional compensation programs. According to CPRE's Carolyn Kelley, the Performance Pay Plan in Douglas County, Colorado includes "base pay, knowledge-based pay (pay for education units), performance-based pay, skill-based pay, responsibility pay, and group incentive awards (2000). The program has undergone external evaluation twice and shows a positive effect on retention beyond the effect of conventional upgrade requirements (Kelley, 2000).

Loans and Loan Forgiveness

According to *Quality Counts 2000*, 27 states have college scholarships, forgivable loans, or loan assumption for teachers. There are 11 states that target high-achieving teachers, 10 that focus on minority candidates, 18 on subject specific areas, and 10 on hard-to-staff schools. Funding for state programs ranges from $75,000 in Delaware to $12.7 million in California. A total of 28,078 recipients were involved in one or more programs nationwide during 1999 (*Education Week*, 2000).

The programs vary in their benefits and requirements. North Carolina provides both financial assistance and guidance for participants in their Teaching Fellows Program. In exchange, the graduates agree to teach in North Carolina schools for four years after graduation. About 65% have continued to teach in North Carolina

according to most recent evaluation data (Olson, 2000). Interest in such programs also varies. For instance, while Georgia lawmakers reduced the availability of scholarships in response to low demand, high demand recently led Mississippi to double the number of its scholarships (Olson, 2000). This comparison does not take into account factors such as other competing scholarship programs or how well a program has been publicized.

Housing

Policymakers and educators agree that teachers and communities both benefit when teachers can afford to live in and become a part of the communities where they teach. There is no question that housing affordability affects urban, rural, and suburban districts' ability to attract qualified candidates. Recently many wealthy suburbs—primarily those in the country's high-tech corridors—have begun facing their own teacher shortages due to skyrocketing housing costs. For this reason, many teachers are choosing not to teach in these districts, and those who do are facing long commutes to work.

While a number of different government and community-based groups have sought to address this problem, a patchwork approach has developed. Apart from anecdotal evidence suggesting that housing was a consideration when deciding to enter or remain in a particular district, we were unable to locate other information about the effectiveness or prevalence of housing programs.

Federal Programs

Housing assistance programs may be sorted by funding sources. At the federal level, teachers in certain areas have access to reduced-cost home purchases and reduced down-payment mortgage programs. In addition, the House of Representatives recently considered a bill that would reduce the FHA down payment of 3% to 1% for uniformed service personnel and educators (Galley, 2001).

State Programs

The states of Connecticut, Mississippi, and California have created programs to help teachers purchase homes. In Connecticut, employees of urban school districts who teach in high-need areas are eligible for down-payment assistance and low-interest mortgages (Galley, 2001).

Mississippi provides an incentive to teach in areas where teacher shortages exist by providing up to $6,000, in the form of a forgivable loan, to cover the down payment on a house. For every year of service, the loan is reduced by one-third (Mississippi State Codes, 1999).

In California, teachers in low-performing schools may access the Extra Credit Program, which offers reduced-interest loans and down-payment assistance (California State University Chancellor's Office, 2001). Another program was created when Freddie Mac partnered with the teachers retirement system in California to form CalStars. This program provides zero-down mortgages for teachers by having 95% of the mortgage financed through a commercial bank or credit union, which is later purchased by Freddie Mac. The remaining 5% is financed by the teachers retirement system and is not payable until the house is sold (Mortgage Bankers Association, 2000).

The response to the CalStars program has been so positive that Freddie Mac is looking to create partnerships with other teacher retirement systems so it can offer this program in their states (Mortgage Bankers Association, 2000).

City Subsidies

In order to attract teachers to the Baltimore, Maryland school district, city officials have funded a special incentive program. It offers teachers up to $5,000 toward a down payment on a home in the Baltimore area, as well as a $1,200 relocation payment. This program is also available to other city employees (Galley, 2001).

District-Owned Housing

As the cost of living surpasses increases in teacher salaries, several districts have begun to invest in their own housing for new recruits and incumbent teachers. Districts such as Eagle, Colorado, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and the Sunset neighborhood in San Francisco, California, have begun to purchase or build apartments for teachers (Galley 2001).

For instance, in Eagle County, Colorado, new teachers are enticed with reduced rent in district-owned apartments for the first two years of their employment. These district-owned apartments overcome one of the major

hurdles of moving to the Vail Valley—being able to find affordable housing.

Corporate and Community Incentives

Corporations and business organizations have also tried to assist school district efforts to recruit and retain teachers by providing housing incentives. These range from reduced move-in costs for apartments to mortgage assistance. For example, California teachers in San Jose and Cupertino can take advantage of Move In For Less. This program, organized by the Cupertino Chamber of Commerce and the Tri-County Apartment Association, offers teachers reduced move-in costs for apartment rentals (Cupertino Chamber of Commerce, 2000). Helping teachers afford to purchase a home, Silicon Valley-based Intel offers teachers in Santa Clara, California assistance with their mortgage payment. In addition, Bank of America offers teachers nationwide zero-down home loans for qualified buyers (DeGroat, 2000 and Galley, 2001).

One grassroots solution to the shortage of affordable housing for teachers has been organized by the Rotarians of Los Gatos and Saratoga, California. Their Cottages for Teachers program calls on members of the community to provide reduced-cost rentals for teachers. Their goal is to make available 12 such rental units for the 2001–2002 school year (Ray, 2000).

Benefits

In a recent interview with Teacher$Talk, a publication of the Teacher Annuity and Insurance Association (TIAA), Dr. David Benson, Superintendent of Blue Valley Public Schools in Overland Park, Kansas noted, "Benefits are an important issue in closing a deal with an incoming staff member and in increasing the chances of keeping our existing staff" (TIAA/CREF, 2001). However, data on benefits was scarce and none could be located that showed which benefits are most cost effective in recruiting and retaining teachers.

In recent years, benefit programs have begun to address specific issues of attrition. With a large percentage of teachers leaving the profession to raise families, some districts, such as Buford, Georgia, have begun to offer child-care benefits (Chaika, 2000).

Discount Programs

Community groups and corporations offer various forms of discounts and benefits for teachers. Teachers generally find out about these programs through advertising (such as the Bank of America Home Mortgage Program), through organizations such as the National Education Association, or by word-of-mouth. More recently, some discount programs are also being advertised on the Internet.[2] For example, Seattle University's School of Education has begun to include references to "teacher perks" on their website (Seattle University, 2001), and California lists some of these extra benefits on its statewide CalTeach website (Calteach,2001).

The advantage to discount programs is that they function at no cost to the school district. Organizations or corporations bear the cost differential and often do the promoting as well. Unfortunately, the word has not gotten out and many teachers are unaware of the options. We were unable to locate studies that have examined the utilization and efficacy of these programs. While anecdotal evidence suggests teachers appreciate discount programs, it appears unlikely that most will have a major impact on attracting or retaining teachers.

Classroom or Personal Use

Recognizing that teachers often pay for classroom materials out of their own pockets, some retailers offer discounts for teachers who are purchasing classroom-related materials. These may range from software to office supplies to books.

Other discounts are offered for a teacher's personal use and are aimed at reducing their cost of living. Examples of these programs include reduced move-in expenses for apartments, real estate rebates, discounted membership or entry fees for local attractions, specialized mortgages, and retailer discounts. Membership in a local teachers credit union may also carry certain benefits or discounted services.

Community-Based Discount Programs

Some communities have initiated committees to encourage, organize, and disseminate information about local corporate or non-profit incentives. For example, the city of San Francisco

has established a Teacher Incentive Program web page and has begun to compile a listing of local discounts for teachers (San Francisco Education Fund, 2001). In Cupertino, California, the local chamber of commerce has organized a group of retailers who offer discounts to teachers.

Retirement

Some retirement programs have found that helping teachers prepare for retirement may be an effective incentive to retain teachers.[3] Many are experimenting in this area. For example, Nevada is considering legislation that will provide years of retirement credit in return for teaching in high-need schools (Chaika, 2000). Some states, such as Colorado, do not require that teachers pay into the social security system. In Loudon County, Virginia, the county pays for the employees' retirement contributions (Chaika, 2000).

Many districts tap into the pool of retired teachers to help ease the teacher shortage, especially retirees who serve as substitute teachers. However, by the end of the calendar year, schools often face a substitute crisis. By then, retirees have reached their maximum number of allowable workdays, above which they risk jeopardizing their retirement benefits. In response, New York and Washington are considering legislation to allow retired teachers to return to the classroom without losing pension benefits (Chaika 2000, State Democratic Caucus, 2001).

Increasingly, retirement programs are often responsible for aggravating the teacher shortage crisis. Districts, and sometimes states, offer "early retirement" bonuses to entice older, more experienced teachers into retirement. Invariably this option is used when a district finds it economically advantageous to replace more expensive, senior teachers with less expensive, younger ones.

■ Strategy Category #3: Increase teaching expertise through expanded professional support.

Skillful teaching is a constantly evolving practice. Support programs that provide ongoing skill development to new and inexperienced teachers may lower attrition rates by reducing the isolation many teachers feel while improving classroom practices. In general, these programs focus on four areas: induction, mentoring, peer review and assistance, and career development.

Induction

Many school districts rely on their induction programs to entice new recruits to their district and to retain teachers once they have entered the district. Two-thirds of the nation's largest city school districts offer induction and early support programs for beginning teachers as an incentive to recruit teachers (Boyer, 2000). Nationwide, however, only 17 states currently operate funded induction programs, ranging from $150,000 statewide in Virginia to $80.2 million in California (Fideler & Haskelhorn, 1999).

In general, an induction program is a combination of orientation and support for new teachers. Induction programs often include orientation to the district, and assistance with curriculum planning and classroom management. The key, of course, is identifying the needs of new teachers and meeting them with timely, useful, cost effective training.

Usually a combination of formal and informal assistance is provided. Examples include orientation to the school, loans of curriculum materials from more experienced teachers, limited assignments of extra duties, and funding for classroom materials. At the middle and high school level, some key strategies include providing new teachers with their own classroom so that they don't have to travel from room to room each hour, and assigning them no more than two subject preparations per semester. Since time is a scarce resource for educators, many programs provide release time for new teachers and mentors (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000).

Most programs focus on first-year teachers, while others include teachers in their first three years, those teaching out of their field, or teachers who otherwise may need extra assistance. Often as the program's scope increases, it overlaps with or incorporates a district's peer review and assistance program. Incentives for new teachers to complete an induction or professional development program may include stipends for participation, tiered credentialing, units towards

salary advancement or master's degrees, or support in preparation for National Board Certification.[4]

Connecticut's BEST Program
Connecticut has designed a tiered, integrated approach to training. Recognizing the stages of development that new teachers typically pass through, the program's architects have developed a four-year development path. The first year focuses on developing a support system for the new teacher, years two and three on creating a teaching portfolio, and year four on student results. All four years use student work as the basis for analysis, reflection, peer review, and support. The professional development plan is flexible enough to allow direction by the new teacher to meet his or her needs and professional development goals. The program components are matched to state credentialing standards and to skills required for National Board Certification (Connecticut Department of Education 2001).

Washington's "Garage Sales"
In Olympia, Washington, retiring teachers offer their classroom materials at a "garage sale" where new teachers can "shop" for the materials they need to create their own classroom activities (WEA, 2001).

Funding and Other Constraints
Planners will want to be aware of constraints that may impede efforts to set up induction programs or limit their effectiveness. For instance, some states impose program mandates without providing adequate funding to back their success. One district in Tucson, Arizona, discontinued its induction program because it could not locate enough substitutes to provide release time for mentor teachers (Fideler & Haskelhorn, 1999).

San Diego recently found itself in a quandary when it planned to use induction funding from California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (BTSA) to assist its new teachers, many of whom did not meet credentialing requirements.[5] Unfortunately, BTSA funds may only be used in support of fully credentialed teachers. Thus, those presumably in the greatest need could not benefit (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000).

Sometimes funding constraints may be overcome with creative management and cooperative efforts. Cherry Creek School District in Englewood, Colorado, found the money to fund its Staff Training, Assistance, and Renewal (STAR) program when teachers in the district offered to give up their sabbatical benefits. The result was a 22% increase in the retention rate of new teachers (National Education Association, 2001).

Program Effectiveness
Is induction an effective strategy for teacher recruitment and retention? According to Recruiting New Teachers (RNT), successful induction programs have been shown to reduce new teacher attrition by meeting the specific needs of new teachers and providing them with the support necessary to continue to become effective, experienced educators (Fideler & Haskelhorn, 1999). Findings from the California New Teacher Project evaluation also strongly suggest that good induction programs result in gains in teacher retention and teacher quality (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000).

However, according to RNT, considerable disparity exists in program quality. "Even though 50% of new public school teachers are participating in *some* type of induction program during their first year of teaching (60% in some urban schools), the scope and quality of support can range from effective, comprehensive, multiyear developmental programs to casual, one-shot, brief (and often inadequate) orientation sessions" (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000).

While some data is available regarding the overall effect of induction programs on retention, there seems to be little empirical evidence to help policymakers determine which program components are the most cost effective in reducing attrition and improving student learning. Even so, the overall picture appears promising.

Mentoring

Recruiting New Teachers and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) have listed mentoring as a key component in a successful induction program (NCTAF, 2000). Mentoring programs are typically composed of several components and are often part of a larger induction program. Possible components include: eligibility, training, compensation, job

description, caseload, participation in assessment of new teachers, and assessment of the mentors themselves (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000).

The District Resource Center for NCTAF contains a database of exceptional induction programs that include mentoring. In the center's *Urban Initiative Partners Newsletter,* it compares three programs to provide an idea of scope and depth (NCTAF, 2001).[6] The three programs are the Career in Teaching Program in Rochester, New York, the Resident Teacher Program and Teacher Induction Program in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and the New Teacher Project of the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

In reviewing these programs, NCTAF found that similarities included a partnership with a union or university, the provision for assessment of new teachers' skills, opportunities for staff development, and a screening process for mentors. Each program reported good retention rates for their participants. In its summary, however, the NCTAF report noted: "We do not have enough information to be able to say what components of each program lead to the outcomes they report" (NCTAF, 2001).

Teacher Assessment

Assessment of a teacher's skills, particularly new teachers, is an important part of any career development program and is vital to the creation and maintenance of quality staff. States vary in how they assess new teachers. Seven states require a performance assessment before a teacher may move on to the second stage of certification. These measures may include classroom observation, video, or developing a portfolio (*Education Week,* 2001).

Teacher evaluation may be divided into categories. Formative assessments provide teachers with constructive feedback to help them improve their teaching techniques, while summative assessments look at progress over time and may be used to determine continued employment (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000). From state to state, there is great variance in who may conduct a summative assessment. The most common practice is for an administrator at the teacher's school to conduct the evaluation. Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and South Carolina have local teams who conduct evaluations (*Education Week,* 2001). Another approach being tested in Connecticut is hiring independent consultants to assess new teachers (Connecticut Department of Education, 2001).

Peer Assistance and Review

A recent trend is to incorporate peer assistance and review into the teacher evaluation process. Recruiting New Teachers found that "schools that use peer review have found that it can successfully assist and support teachers and also be effective in weeding out incompetent teachers" (Recruiting New Teachers, 2000). The basic premise is to have experienced teachers provide assistance and review for new teachers, as well as for experienced teachers who have asked for or demonstrated a need for assistance. In some cases, peer assistance and review has expanded to include assistance for all teachers. Table 7 provides a comparison of components among three programs.

Districts that make use of peer review and assistance are showing an increase in the number of teachers retained. For example, "Peer assistance and review in Rochester, New York has led to the retention of 90% of beginning teachers after their first year in the classroom; the retention rate was about 60% before the program was implemented" (RNT, 2001). Yet these programs have made only slight efforts to collect baseline data on turnover rates prior to initiation of the new retention effort. As for cost effectiveness, very little data exists that examines program components, their combinations, and relative cost to determine their effect on retention and student achievement.

Staff Development

As was pointed out in the national report, *Good Teaching Matters...A Lot,* "Teacher effectiveness is not forever fixed" (Haycock, 1998). The continuing education and development needs of teachers vary over the course of their careers. To be effective, continuing education must be an ongoing, sustained effort to provide accessible, high quality programs that meet the needs of teachers.

According to NCTAF, reinventing professional development is among its

TABLE 7. A Comparison of Three Peer Assistance and Review Programs, 2000

School District		Rochester, NY	Cincinnati, OH	Seattle, WA
Program participants	New teachers	✔	✔	✔
	Experienced teachers in need	✔	✔	✔
	All teachers	✔		
Assistance and review provided by:	Consulting teacher			Assistance only
	Team of teachers	✔		
	Team of administration and teachers		✔	
Assessment	Formative	✔	✔	None
	Summative	✔	✔	None
Program evaluation	Cost	Careers in teaching (includes induction and peer review) $850,000 1996–1997	$1.7 million 1994–95	No data
	Outside evaluation	1980s	None	No data
	Internal notes	90% retention rates	2 teachers in 10 years referred for intervention	No data

Source: Data summarized from Recruiting New Teachers, 2000 and Fideler & Haskelhorn, 1999.

five major recommendations. Across the country, school districts are working to reform staff development in education. These reform ideas include designing more effective continuing education, forming partnerships with universities and private training organizations, and helping teachers develop a career path that rewards and supports continued learning. By providing teachers with the opportunity and incentive to advance their own development, districts gain a powerful recruiting and retention incentive tool that directly impacts student achievement.

The cost effectiveness of investing in career development seems to be positive. A recent WestEd policy brief claims that "dollars invested in teaching quality net larger student achievement gains than the same dollars invested in any other type of school resource" (2000).[7] The National Center for Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) has also placed its support behind creating stable, high-quality sources of professional development (1996). The University of North Carolina at Greensboro recently reviewed National Board Certified teachers and determined that they

"outperform their peers who are not board certified on 11 of 13 key dimensions of teacher expertise" (Southeast Center for Teacher Quality, 2001). Future work should more carefully account for "effects" rooted in the attributes of teachers who apply for the National Board Certification, rather than the certification process itself.

Coaching

Some districts have begun to provide in-class coaching to teachers. Coaches are not used to assist deficient teachers, but to help experienced teachers teach better, implement new curricula, or learn to teach to standards. One of the greatest hurdles coaching faces among teachers is the stigma attached to asking for help, and the fear of it contributing to a negative evaluation.

Partnerships for Continued Subject Learning

While not always widely publicized, many corporations, nonprofits, and universities are forming partnerships to provide teachers with subject-specific training. The cost of these programs is often negligible for the districts, since many are provided locally and at little or no cost to the participant. For others, there are grants available for tuition, and either districts or the teachers pay for travel expenses. A particular strength of many of these programs is that they provide materials—or grants for materials—that aim to be up-to-date, research-based, and relevant.

For instance, Intel, in cooperation with Microsoft, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and The Learning Space, a Washington-based education organization, sponsor the Intel Teach to the Future Program. The program teaches teachers how to effectively integrate technology into their curriculum. Participants get hands-on experience in web page development, various presentation programs, such as PowerPoint, and evaluating online data. Teachers receive Microsoft software and a new laptop computer after successfully completing the program. In return, each participant agrees to conduct staff inservices based on the Teach to the Future Program for 40 other teachers (WEA, 2001).

University-Based Career Development

Traditionally, universities have trained new teachers, offered advanced education degrees, and also provided continuing education for classroom teachers. Many have seen their roles expand even further as they become centers for staff and career development. The University of North Carolina is a prime example. It currently hosts three career development projects: the Mathematics and Science Education network, North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and the North Carolina Principal. In the planning stages is yet a fourth project, the Fellows Executive Academy, which will support the professional development needs of superintendents throughout the state. In California, Governor Davis has pushed to expand teacher training in the research-rich University of California campuses.

Burnout Intervention

Two unique programs that deal directly with teacher burnout are the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and Courage to Teach in Cullowhee. The North Carolina Center "exists to give teachers respite from burnout" (Steinberg, 2001). Teachers who believe they are at risk for burnout may apply to attend a state-sponsored program at the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching. The classes run the gamut from learning to "nurture the nurturer" to learning to integrate electricity or technology into the curriculum. The center also now provides a leadership training program as an incentive for nominated teachers who have demonstrated leadership potential. Such teachers may become mentors or move into the school principal role.

The cost to the state is approximately $200 per day per teacher, which includes providing a substitute for release coverage. The center's annual budget is approximately $4 million. "An independent survey of the center's alumni, conducted by researchers at the University of West Florida in the early 1990s, found that two of every three teachers who have visited the center believe it had a strong impact on their decision to continue teaching, even three years after they left the center" (Steinberg, 2001).

Courage to Teach is a two-year program of personal and professional renewal for public school teachers. The fundamental precept of the program is that good teaching requires self-knowledge

and that good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher (Intrator and Scribner, 2000). Guided by a professional trainer, participants first design a trial program for themselves, and then trained facilitators lead participants in a series of eight retreats over a two-year period. Each group is comprised of approximately 20 K–12 teachers who meet quarterly. Although the program is designed for K–12 teachers, it could also be used effectively with preschool teachers.

Two variations of this program currently operate. One is to send a teacher to the seminar and the second is to develop a local program. Guidance in program development and budgeting is available through Teacher Formation in Bainbridge, Washington. An independent program evaluation has shown positive results. Program participants have noted a positive effect on their desire to remain in the field, a willingness to take on new leadership roles, and a positive change in their teaching (Intrator & Scribner, 2000). Additional research is required to discern observable change in classroom teaching practices.

Certification

Certification has begun to reflect the idea of a career ladder for teachers. Teachers in Tennessee, for example, may progress through four levels: certificate, apprentice professional, senior, and master teacher (Alexander, 1998). Connecticut and Colorado are both examples of states that require completion of an induction program in order to move beyond the initial teaching credential. National Board Certification has recently been added as an additional form of credentialing. Currently, 27 states offer credentialing incentives and 34 offer financial incentives for attaining National Board Certification (*Education Week,* 2001).

The strategies employed to support teachers in attaining National Board Certification vary greatly among states. The state of Washington, for example, will award teachers a grant as compensation for the time and effort they invest preparing for National Board Certification. South Carolina offers forgivable loans to cover the $2,300 fee, while California pays $10,000 to each teacher who becomes Board certified. The idea of reciprocity has been addressed in New England with a credential that can be utilized in participating states (Connecticut Department of Education, 2000). Also being tried in several states are proposals to grant reciprocity for National Board Certified teachers to receive state credentialing.

Lessons for the Early Education Field

The child-care and early-education community across the nation has rallied behind one basic model, aimed at retaining and professionalizing staff. That model provides teachers and aides with salary augmentations as they receive more training. In North Carolina, this model is known at TEACH; in California, somewhat varying approaches have adopted the label of CARES, or Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability.

In this light, the variable array of K–12 teacher recruitment, induction, and retention programs—aggressively mounted across the nation—is quite remarkable. What lessons for early educators can be distilled from our review of these public school efforts?

□ **The mere size of public investments at the K–12 level is notable, compared to programs in early education.**

For example, we identified $654 million in state spending in California at the K–12 level, or about 20 times the state's investment in recruitment and retention at the early education level (pre-kindergarten).

□ **The range and variety of experiments at the K–12 level is equally impressive, compared to those in early education.**

California and other states are supporting inventive K–12 recruitment efforts. These include bonuses, induction and mentoring programs for new teachers, housing subsidies, inservice training, and other efforts to professionalize the teacher's role and responsibilities. In the child-care field, California has supported a modest mentor program and limited inservice opportunities. But the scope and economic attractiveness of these efforts are quite constrained, relative to the more ambitious initiatives in K–12 education.

□ **So far, little data is available on the effectiveness of K–12 recruitment and retention programs that might provide a direction for comparable efforts in early education.**

One troubling lesson is whether these K–12 education efforts are yielding any hard evidence on their effectiveness. The California Children and Families Commission is currently spending a considerable amount to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the CARES retention and professional development models. Yet many states—in addition to California—continue to fund large recruitment and retention programs with very little information on which models work and why.

A related issue is the fact that many of the innovative K–12 programs that have developed tend to be small and piecemeal in nature. This makes it more difficult to replicate them on a large scale so that their effectiveness can be measured. Few states have yet to consolidate their numerous strategies around those that empirically have been shown to be effective.

We have witnessed a remarkable growth in the early education sector in California. Thus far, however, little attention has been paid to the essential stability and quality of the workforce compared to the ambitious K–12 initiatives. Early educators have much to learn from their colleagues in the broader public education arena about more aggressively exploring alternative strategies for reducing turnover and raising educational quality. Ideally in the coming years, the early education community and policymakers will experiment carefully with a variety of approaches. By doing so, they can avoid a mistake made by education policymakers in the K–12 arena, who have funded a variety of programs while knowing little about their effectiveness.

References

Alexander, L. (1998, April). Let's pay our best teachers more. *Readers Digest.* Retrieved August 6, 2001, from www.lamaralexander.com/articles_04.htm.

Archer, J. (2000, September 6). Mass. 'bonus babies' get crash course. *Education Week.* Retrieved September 7, 2000 from www.edweek.com/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=01mabonus.h20.

Blair, J. (2000, August 2). Districts wooing teachers with bonuses, incentives. *Education Week.* Retrieved August 7, 2000 from www.edweek.com/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=43raid.h19.

Blair, J. (2001, May 16). Freddie Mac to expand zero down teacher housing. *Education Week.* Retrieved June 2001 from www.edweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=36housing.h20.

Boyer, L. (2000). The special needs of special educators. *Future Teacher,* 7 (1), 6–7.

California State University Chancellor's Office. (2001). CalTeach Website. Retrieved July 25, 2001, from www.calteach.com.

Center for the Child Care Workforce, March 2000, available at http://www.nccic.org/faqs/salaries.html

Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL 2001). *Teaching and California's future: The status of the teaching profession.* Available at http://www.cftl.org/publications.html.

Chaika, G. (2000). The teacher shortage: Apply, please! *Education World.* Retrieved June 28, 2001, from www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin155.shtml.

Chaika, G. (2000). Will higher pay solve the worst teacher shortage ever? It can't hurt! Retrieved June 28, 2001, from www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin204.shtml.

Cherry Creek School District. (2001). *Staff Training, Assistance and Renewal* (STAR). Retrieved July 2, 2001, from www.ccsd.k12.co.us/dept_hr_ccoffer.shtml.

Chicago Public Schools. (2000). Teacher Retention Unit Website. Retrieved May 4, 2001, from www.cps-humanresources.org/Initiatives/TRU/abouttru.html.

Clewell, B., et al. (2000) *Literature review on teacher recruitment programs.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Available online at www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/eval/.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2001). *Support for beginning teachers through the teacher evaluation process.* Retrieved June 28, 2001, from www.state.ct.us/sde/der/pub...revaluation/support_for_bts%20.htm.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2001). *Ten indicators of a quality teacher evaluation plan.* Retrieved June 28, 2001, from www.state.ct.us/sde/der/pub...revaluation/teacherevalquality.htm.

Cupertino Chamber of Commerce.(Date unknown). Cupertino business for education. [Brochure]. Information available from www.cupertino-chamber.org.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC, 2001). *1999–2000 annual report: Emergency permits and credential waivers.* Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports_on_line.html on November 2, 2001.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Solving the dilemmas of teaching supply, demand and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Schlan, E. (1996). Who teaches and why: Dilemmas of building a profession for twenty-first

century schools. In *Handbook of research on teacher education,* ed. J. Sikula, 2d ed., 67-101. New York: MacMillan.

DeGroat, T. J. (2000, June 19). Intel creates teacher housing fund. ResponsibilityInc.com. Retrieved June 25, 2001, from www.responsibilityinc.com/departments/philanthropy/intelfun.html.

Education Week. (2000). Quality Counts 2000: Who should teach? Washington, D.C.: Editorial Projects in Education.

Education Week. (2000). Quality Counts 2001: A better balance: Standards, tests, and the tools to succeed. Washington, D.C.: Editorial Projects in Education.

Fideler, E.F., & Haskelhorn, D. (1999). *Learning the ropes: Urban teacher induction programs and practices in the United States.* Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers.

Galley, M. (2001, March 7). For sale: Affordable housing for teachers. *Education Week.* Retrieved March 26, 2001, from www.edweek.com/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=25housing.h20.

Gehring, J. (2001, April 4). Arkansas passes teacher-pay bill. *Education Week,* 24.

Haycock, K. (1998). Good teaching matters...a lot. *Thinking K-16,* 3 (2).

Hirsch, E. (2001). *Teacher recruitment: Staffing classrooms with quality teachers.* Denver: The State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Hirsch, E., Koppich, J.E., & Knapp, M.S. (2001). *Revisiting what states are doing to improve the quality of teaching: An update on patterns and trends.* Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Intrator, S., & Scribner, M. (2000). *An evaluation of the Courage to Teach Program.* Unpublished report. Retrieved on October 15, 2001, from www.teacherformation.org/pdf/full_eval/html.

Kelley, C. (2000). *Douglas County Performance Pay Plan.* Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Kelley, C., Odden, A., Milanowski, A., & Heneman, H. III. (2000, February). *The motivational effects of school-based performance awards.* Policy Briefs. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Milanowski, A. (2000). School-based performance award programs and teacher motivation. *Journal of Education Finance,* 25 (4), 517–44.

Mississippi State Codes. (1999). *Mississippi Employer-Assisted Housing Teacher Program.* Retrieved June 26, 2001, from www.mscode/archives/1999/37/159/0011.htm.

Mortgage Bankers Association. (2000, April 10). Freddie Mac launches mortgages for teachers. Retrieved August 3, 2001, from www.mbaa.org.resident/lib2000/0410.html.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: NCTAF.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2000, Summer). District induction programs that work. *Urban Initiative Partners Newsletter,* 2 (2), 1–10.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. District Resource Center. Retrieved June 15, 2001, from www.nctaf.org/resourcedistrict.

National Education Association. (2001). *NEA-Saturn-UAW honor innovative partnerships to improve teacher quality.* News Release. Retrieved June 21, 2001, from www.nea.org/nr/nr010606.html.

New York City Board of Education. (2001). TeachNY Website. Retrieved August 14, 2001, from www.teachny.com.

Odden, A. (2001). About knowledge and skill-based pay. Teacher Compensation Project Website. Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved August 15, 2001, from www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/teachercomp.

Olson, L. (2001, January 11). Sweetening the pot. *Education Week,* 22 (17).

Parks, T. (2000). Call Me Mister—Program summary. [Brochure]. Clemson University.

Ray, R. (2000, November 29). Bill Cilker & Rotarians address teacher housing. *Los Gatos Weekly Times.* Retrieved June 25, 2001, from www.metroactive.com/papers/los.gatos.weekly-times/11.29.00/teacherhousing-048.html.

Recruiting New Teachers. (2000). *A guide to developing teacher induction programs.* Belmont: Recruiting New Teachers.

Reid, K. S. (2001, August 8). Prep-school program opens doors for minority teachers. *Education Week.* Retrieved August 13, 2001, from www.edweek.com/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=43recruit.h20.

San Francisco Education Fund. (2001). *Teacher Incentive Program.* Retrieved June1, 2001, from www.scefund.org/programs/tip.html.

Seattle University School of Education. (2001). Teacher Perks Website. Retrieved June 2, 2001, from www.seattleu.edu/soe/mit/teacherperks.

Snyder, Jon. (1999). New Haven Unified School District: *A teaching quality system for excellence and equity.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment. Website. Retrieved June 29, 2001, from www.scctr.org.

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2000). *Imagine a world where national board certified teachers were truly rewarded for knowledge and skill.* Retrieved July 25, 2001, from www. Teachingquality.org/resources/outofthebox/imagineaworld.html.

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2000). National Board Certification—Linking teacher performance with student achievement. Retrieved July 25, 2001, from www. Teachingquality.org/resources/outofthebox/nbctstudy.html.

State Democratic Caucus. (2001). Retired teachers return without losing retirement. Retrieved August 21, 2001, from www.sdc.wa.gov/releases/shin/2001/teachers.html.

Steinberg, J. (2001, January 7). Giving the teacher balm for burnout. *New York Times.*

Retrieved May 29, 2001, from www.nytimes.com/2001/01/07/education/07EDLIFE-SPA.html.

Teacher Training Agency. (2001). Website. Retrieved September 4, 2001, from www.canteach.gov.uk.

TIAA. (2000, June). Filling the Gap. *Teacher$ Talk*, 6–8.

United States Department of Labor. (2000). National employment and wage data from the Occupational Employment Statistics survey by occupation. Available at: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ocwage.t01.htm.

Washington Education Association. (2001, October). WEA Olympic reaches out with ambitious program for new members. *WEA Action*, 39 (2).

Washington Education Association. (2001, May). "Intel Teach to the Future" to train 4,000 teachers to use technology at school. *WEA Action*, 38 (8).

Washington Education Association. (2001, May). Grants pay National Board Certification fee. *WEA Action*, 38 (8).

WestEd. (2000, November). *Ensuring teacher quality: A continuum of teacher preparation and development* (Policy brief).

Wilson, C.L. (2000, January 13). The salary gap. From *Education Week Quality Counts 2000: Who should teach?* Washington, D.C.: Editorial Projects in Education.

Endnotes

[1] For a full discussion of additional pay, please refer to the CPRE website at http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/teachercomp.

[2] Some organizations offering teacher discounts include Apple Computers, Dell, Gateway, Microsoft, Bank of America, Barnes and Noble, Franklin Covey, and Hobby Lobby.

[3] The National Council on Teacher Retirement offers several resources on their website at http://www.nctr.org.

[4] For a complete discussion of current programs in induction, Recruiting New Teachers has published Learning the Ropes: Urban Teacher Programs and Practices which includes detailed review[*s] of several programs and highlights promising practices. RNT has also published *A Guide to Developing Teacher Induction programs.*

[5] BTSA is a state program "jointly sponsored by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education to provide beginning teachers with formative assessment of their teaching practices and professional development to promote their effectiveness with students; retention in teaching; and satisfaction with the occupation" (Recruiting New Teachers, 1999).

[6] The NCTAF website contains a full directory of partner programs and a discussion of their components. Also available online is the Center newsletter.

[7] Our reading of this empirical research does not lead to such a sweeping claim. Not enough studies have estimated effect sizes from comparable reforms operating under similar local conditions. We do agree with WestEd analysts that effects from well-crafted programs are yielding promising effects.

PACE POLICY BRIEF

University of California
Graduate School of Education
3653 Tolman Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-1670

Stanford University
Graduate School of Education
Stanford, CA 94305

RELATED PACE PUBLICATIONS—EARLY EDUCATION

- Judith Carroll. ***How to Pay for Child Care? Local Innovations Help Working Families.*** Policy Brief 01-1, Spring 2001. *From the Growing Up in Poverty Project.* Available on our website, or may be ordered for $10.
- ***Remember the Children: Mothers Balance Work and Child Care Under Welfare Reform.*** *2000. From the Growing Up in Poverty Project.* $25.
- ***New Lives for Poor Families? Mothers and Children Move Through Welfare Reform.*** *2002. From the Growing Up in Poverty Project.* $25.
- James F. Mensing, Desiree French, Bruce Fuller, and Sharon Lynn Kagan. ***Child Care Selection Under Welfare Reform: How Mothers Balance Work Requirements and Parenting.*** August 2000. Available on our website.
- Bruce Fuller, Yueh-Wen Chang, Sawako Suzuki, and Sharon Lynn Kagan. ***Child-Care Aid and Quality for California Families: Special Focus on San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties.*** Working Paper Series 01-2, Spring 2001. *From the Growing Up in Poverty Project.* $10.
- Susanna Loeb, Bruce Fuller, Diane Hirshberg. ***Estimating Unmet Need for Child Care and Preschool: Alternative Definitions and Analytic Tools.*** 2002. Forthcoming.

To obtain copies, please send a check payable to UC Regents to PACE. The publications order form is available on the PACE website: http://pace.berkeley.edu.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").